

APRIL 1, 1952
710th BROADCAST

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 278 Stations of the ABC Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Is Stabilization Working?

Moderator, HOUSTON PETERSON

Speakers

MICHAEL V. DISALLE

ALBERT M. COLE

COMING

—April 8, 1952—

**“Does the President’s Security Order
Threaten the People’s Right to
Information?”**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 49



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 17

No. 49



Is Stabilization Working?

The Broadcast of April 1, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p. m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Network, originated from the First Congregational Church, Toledo, Ohio, under the auspices of the Meeting House Series of the First Congregational Church.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

MICHAEL V. DISALLE—Former Director of Price Stabilization of the Economic Stabilization Agency; former Mayor of Toledo; now candidate for Democratic Senator from Ohio. Mr. DiSalle's first public office was as a member of the Ohio State Legislature in the 1930's. He gained widespread recognition for his sponsorship of the Toledo Labor-Management Citizens Committee, which has been credited with insuring industrial peace in Toledo for the past several years. Mr. DiSalle is past president of the Ohio State Mayor's Association and has long been an active leader in the United States Conference of Mayors. He is a senior partner in the law firm of DiSalle, Green and Hadad. In addition, Mr. DiSalle has a great interest in the problems of small business which he attributes to his association with his father in the DiSalle Electroplating Company.

CONGRESSMAN ALBERT M. COLE—Republican of Kansas; member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Mr. Cole represented Jackson and Atchison Counties in Kansas as State Senator from 1941-1944. He also served as a member of the Kansas Legislative Council during these years. A lawyer, he received his degree from the University of Chicago in 1925. Before his election to Congress, Mr. Cole held the position of county attorney for Jackson County, and was a member and president of the Holton (Kansas) School Board. He was first elected as a representative to the Seventy-ninth Congress and has served consecutive terms ever since.

Moderator: DR. HOUSTON PETERSON—Author and Professor of Philosophy, Rutgers University.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Is Stabilization Working?

Announcer:

Tonight Town Meeting is happy to be back in Toledo, Ohio, where for the second year the program is a feature of the Meeting House Series of the First Congregational Church. Its minister, Dr. John Walker, originated the Meeting House Series three years ago.

Sponsored by the Men's Club of the church, the series each year brings to Toledo a distinguished program of lectures and special events. The First Congregational Church, from which we are broadcasting, is located on Collingwood Boulevard, which has become famous as the "Avenue of Churches."

Situated on the western tip of Lake Erie, the city of Toledo now has a population of more than 400,000. It is recognized as one of the largest glass, petroleum, and refinery centers. Because of its strategic location and excellent port facilities, Toledo rates fourth in tonnage in the United States and is considered the greatest coal shipping port in the world.

Now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is the well-known author, lecturer, and professor of philosophy at Rutgers University, Dr. Houston Peterson.

Moderator Peterson:

Good evening, friends. I'm glad to be making my first visit to Toledo, and Town Meeting is glad to be here for the second successive year as part of the Meeting House Series of the First Congregational Church.

It is very difficult these days to state any issue in a simple, detached way without stepping on somebody's toes. Take this term "stabilization." It seems to mean

a sensible attempt to control economic forces. It seems to mean a search for social order.

But for many people, stabilization implies a dangerous disturbance of vast and delicate economic mechanisms. Stabilization calls up to their minds government intrusion into affairs that no human mind or group of minds can adequately understand.

Is stabilization working? Our two speakers for this evening are both experienced lawyers. Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, who thinks that stabilization has been working pretty well, is here on his own home ground. He was a popular, dynamic mayor of Toledo, and he was as popular as any man could be, I suspect, as Director of Price Stabilization of the Economic Stabilization Agency. He flew in a few minutes ago from Napoleon, Ohio, where I am told he was making a semi-political speech, for Mr. DiSalle is now a Democratic candidate for the United States Senate from Ohio.

The gentleman who says that stabilization is *not* working is a fighting Republican Congressman from the great corn-growing, basketball playing state of Kansas. Mr. Albert M. Cole, before entering the House of Representatives seven years ago, had been a county attorney, president of his city school board, and a member of the State Senate. Now in the midst of his fourth term in Congress, he is a member of the House Banking Committee and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over price and wage stabilization.

So you see, both of these men are sharp on this general point. Gentlemen, if you will join me here now to get down to broad

fundamentals for a moment, what about the very idea of stabilization? Is it a necessary thing? Is it a good thing? Mr. DiSalle, will you take a shot at that?

Mr. DiSalle: Well, Dr. Peterson, if I might revert to type, because they say mayors always revert to type, might I take this opportunity first to welcome you to Toledo? Dr. Peterson and I appeared on America's Town Meeting on January 1 of this year in which we both agreed that all was not lost.

I also want to welcome Congressman Cole on my home ground. I've been playing on his home grounds for the past year in Washington, and we've had many games when I appeared before his committee, and also I guess we had one engagement in New York, didn't we, Congressman? I want to say about Congressman Cole that although we've been on the opposite sides of many questions in the past year, I think he is a sincere, conscientious, hard-working member of Congress whose opinion I deeply respect.

Now for the question of stabilization. You didn't say economic stabilization, you just said stabilization, Dr. Peterson. Of course, stabilization is something to be desired and something to be worked for, regardless of what kind of stabilization you're talking about. If you are talking about emotional stabilization, it's something to be desired. Of course, economic stabilization at a time like this when the Nation finds itself in a grave emergency is something not only desirable, but something that we must work to achieve.

The program in the past year has been a successful program, and although this is not a speech but only an answer to a question, might I just briefly state the facts

as we found them on the 1st of January of 1951 and tell you something about what the story is today?

In early January of 1951, we found that since Korea the cost of living in the United States had increased 8.1 percent. The wholesale index had gone up 16.3 percent. The spot market index had gone up 49 percent.

Since the imposition of controls, and dating February 15, 1951, to February 15, 1952, we found that the rise in the consumer price index has been restrained to 2.2 percent, that the wholesale index is actually off approximately 3 percent, and that the spot market index is down 22 percent over what it was at the beginning of 1951.

And so we say that stabilization has been effective and that without stabilization there could have been very little done to restrain the psychological forces that were at work in this country from June of 1950 until the latter part of January of 1951. At that time, we found the American people gravely excited.

A good many people remembered the shortages of World War II and began to buy everything they could lay their hands on. They were buying sheets, they were buying automobiles, they were buying tires, electrical appliances, and merchants were building up their inventories, also contemplating shortages. Manufacturers who knew that soon their productive facilities would be diverted to the military effort were buying raw materials and expanding their civilian production. With these three large forces of our economy all engaged in buying, there was bound to be price pressure, and as a result we were in a spiral—a wage-price spiral—a race between unrealistic

prices and unrealistic wages that could have very well destroyed the entire economy of this country.

The job that has been done in the past year has been a job that has brought stability and effective stability.

Moderator Peterson: Thank you very much, Mr. DiSalle. Now before you take up some of those specific points, Congressman Cole, I wonder if you will comment on this general idea of economic stabilization. I think you may hold the whole idea somewhat in suspicion.

Congressman Cole: Thank you, Dr. Peterson. Before I say anything about price and wage stabilization, I want to pay tribute to Mr. Michael DiSalle, former mayor of Toledo, who came to Washington as a courageous and able administrator of this program. We in Washington respect Mr. DiSalle, and I am sure that you do here in Toledo.

Well, Mr. Peterson, this afternoon I stopped in one of the stores of Toledo and there purchased a necktie. I have it on. I wonder how you like it? I passed two or three stores before entering a store to purchase this particular necktie. Then when I entered the store I was shown a selection of neckties. Some of them were loud and gaudy and others were a bit more restrained.

Due to my rather old age, I decided I would get a restrained necktie, but I had an opportunity to purchase neckties today for 25 cents, for \$1.00, for \$2.50, for \$15.00. I had an opportunity to buy silk neckties and wool neckties and different kinds of neckties, and they were offered to me, in not only one store, but in dozens of stores in this great city. Then I

said to myself, yes, it is working here in Toledo as it works elsewhere—the free market.

The free market is that market which consists of millions of people making billions of decisions every day, and those millions of people making billions of decisions constitute the free market. They decide what shall be sold, how it shall be sold, to whom it shall be sold, and at what price it shall be sold.

That is the American way. That is the free way. And that is why I say that stabilization in this type of economy is not working today.

Price control attempts to treat the symptoms of high prices and inflation. High prices are not the cause of inflation, high prices are the result of inflation. Now, if high prices are the result of inflation and not the cause, it is my argument that we should attempt to cure the cause of inflation, and that cause is more dollars chasing after too few goods. So I leave the question there for Mr. DiSalle and myself to discuss with you tonight.

One thing more. A lighted fuse attached to a time bomb occurred last week, when the Wage Stabilization Board rendered its decision in the steel case. It is my judgment that if that recommendation is carried out, stabilization will not only be failing to work, it will be blown to bits. Thank you.

Dr. Peterson: Thank you very much, Mr. Cole. Now, Mr. DiSalle, I think it was inevitable that we should tie in the steel controversy and Mr. Wilson's resignation with our discussion tonight. Now you have been in a very hot seat, as Mr. Wilson has, and I jotted down a question here. Would it interest you? Why did Mr. Wilson resign? Put that in a word or

two for us. Would you have done the same in his situation?

Mr. DiSalle: Well, that's a very easy question, but I suppose the answer to it might be just as obvious as the restraint in Congressman Cole's tie. I just don't know why Charley Wilson resigned.

Actually the basis for the settlement of the steel dispute was arrived at in April of 1951. At that time, the then Economic Stabilization Administrator, Eric Johnston, issued a directive to the Office of Price Stabilization which said that no price increase should be granted to any industry unless that industry could show that its earnings had been depressed below a level represented by 85 percent of the average earnings during the best three years, 1946 to 1949.

At that time the standard was established, the so-called Johnston Earning Standard.

Today the question is not as complicated as a lot of people would want to make it, for the steel industry has two outlets under which it might secure relief. One is the so-called Capehart Amendment, which makes it possible for the steel industry to recover in its price structure those cost increases that they had from Korea to July 26, 1951.

After availing themselves of that, if they still find that the wage increases that were granted would lower their earnings below the 85 percent level as represented in the Johnston Earning Standard, then they would be entitled to price relief under those standards.

It's one of those things in which the rules of the game had been established and were established a long time ago, and just like in any other game, it just isn't fair to change the rules in the middle

of the game in order to meet a particular situation.

Or if you adopt standards and then permit yourself to yield on a matter of judgment on those standards, merely because of pressure that may be applied, then you no longer have a program that operates according to rules and according to regulations, but you have a program that is operating according to pressure.

Now if those standards were not fair, it should have been determined in April of 1951 that those standards were not fair. Certainly all the persons connected with the stabilization program at that time knew what those standards were and had an opportunity to approve them.

Dr. Peterson: Mr. Cole needs no stimulation from me to comment on these remarks.

Congressman Cole: Dr. Peterson I appreciate your calling me back to the mike because after all I opened the conversation with respect to the steel settlement.

Now we must decide one of two things: Does the recommendation of the Wage Stabilization Board require a rise in prices, or can it be absorbed? Now we have two things to decide. We can accept one or the other. Does it draw unto itself a rise in prices in steel, and if so, then what will be done with it, or if it does not, how is that possible?

Now, I am not an expert in the steel industry. The steel people claim that the recommendation will cost them one billion dollars. If it costs the steel people one billion dollars, where will a billion dollars come from? Will it come from increased productivity in the steel mills, or will it come out of profits?

It is my understanding further that the steel mills made last year about 600 million dollars' net profit. The steel people say that they will be required to raise the cost of steel to \$12 a ton, if this recommendation is carried out. Maybe they will, maybe they will not.

If they raise the steel price to \$12 a ton, then aluminum, then brass, then all other commodities in this country will also find themselves in a position to require a raise in price, and when that occurs, then all prices will rise and the spiral will continue to be forced upward.

I believe in high wages. I think that everyone should have the highest wage possible to be paid to him or her, but I also believe that when the dollar is paid to the wage earner that the dollar should be sound and should have the purchasing value commensurate with the ability that he has in working power. (*Applause*)

Mr. DiSalle: I suppose that Congressman Cole and the Wage Stabilization Board believe in the same thing evidently. But there certainly can be very little difference of opinion as to the fact that a dollar must be a sound dollar otherwise it isn't worth too much.

I don't suppose we can take too much issue with that, but we get right back to a very fundamental question, and before commenting on that question, I want to make this statement; and that is, there is no field in the entire Nation in which we must maintain a more sound head and approach with a greater deal of tolerance than the labor management field, because they are two conflicting groups and until they learn that their interests are mutual, that both must walk down that same aisle and

that both must share responsibility and that they both have a responsibility to the Nation and to the public as well as to each other, we'll just never have any labor management peace.

Now in this case, as in many labor management cases, I understand that the original demands of these steel workers were something like 40 cents an hour. The steel industry today says that they need a \$12 a ton rise in price to offset what was granted. I don't know exactly what was granted. I don't think anybody can tell exactly from the accounts that we've had to date exactly what was granted. One story that I read said 12½ cents an hour plus 5 cents in six more months, and that the fringe benefits would bring it up to 21 or 22 cents.

Now if the steel industry is injured and will not be able to earn according to the standards that have been established for effective price stabilization, then they can get a price increase; but I think that the steel industry must first apply for that price increase and show that they cannot absorb this wage increase, that they cannot absorb part of it or all of it, and they need a price increase, before we can get too excited about the present issue.

Dr. Peterson: Now Mr. Cole wants to come in. We are covering so much ground here and our questions are so basic that we are going to have to speed up our comments and shorten them just a little, Mr. Cole.

Congressman Cole: All right, I'll just say now we find out why Charley Wilson quit. Charley Wilson quit because he found that if the steel recommendation would go through there would be a rise in costs of steel. Charley Wilson

felt that that was not proper, that it would cause a continuing spiral of inflation and that the working-man's dollar would be depreciated that much further. The privileged people who would obtain the rise in wages would obtain them at the expense of the white-collared class and the millions and millions of people unorganized in this country who are not recognized or approved by unions and the people on pensions. And so it is important that we maintain the soundness of the dollar. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Peterson: Thank you, Mr. Cole. You started to answer a sample question that was put at the beginning of our meeting. I'd like to go on with that a little bit. You remember that somebody asked this question: Does the present stabilization program insure equality of sacrifice for all segments of the population? Mr. DiSalle spoke of the conflict between the labor management groups, but there are many Americans who are not clearly in either of those groups. So I repeat that question, Mr. DiSalle: Does the present stabilization program insure equality of sacrifice for all segments of the population?

Mr. DiSalle: Certainly that perfect equality of sacrifice is impossible. Some people will always sacrifice more. We certainly can't compare the sacrifices that are made by labor and management or agriculture consumers with the sacrifices that have been made by the young men and women who are going into the armed services—some who are being maimed for life and some who lose their lives—or the sacrifices that are made by the families who lose their bread-winners or their children. That's a sacrifice that we

just can't measure in dollars and cents.

But as far as the equality of sacrifice in the stabilization program, it brings to mind an instance that occurred one day when I was sitting in with Charley Wilson at a meeting of the President's Council on the Defense Mobilization Program. At that particular time the labor representatives were complaining because they were making all the sacrifices and management was doing nothing. The management representatives were complaining because they made all the sacrifices and labor was doing nothing. The agriculture members of the committee were complaining because agriculture was asked to make all the sacrifices and no one else was doing anything.

I turned to Charley Wilson and I said, "Charley, if we haven't accomplished equality of sacrifice, we at least have achieved equality of injustice." (*Laughter.*)

Dr. Peterson: Mr. Cole, a little more from you, sir, on the problem of the equality of sacrifice.

Congressman Cole: Again returning to the steel formula, there are, I believe, about 540,000 steel workers. If they receive this cost of living, so-called raise in the wages, they will have obtained a privilege not granted the other employes of the country. The labor force today amounts to about 46,000,000 men and women. Equality of sacrifice? Equality of sacrifice in rent control? Equality of sacrifice in price control? I say no, there is no equality of sacrifice when you permit a privileged operation where some people obtain advantages over others. (*Applause*)

Mr. DiSalle: I would like to point out that during the year

1951, the cost of living in the United States increased 3½ percent, wages increased 5 percent, and that's about as equal as you can conduct the stabilization program in an economy as complex as ours.

Now certainly we'll have inequalities in the United States, as long as we have people. Some people, because of lack of ability, are unable to earn what other people earn. Some people because of lack of ability to approach certain problems just don't make the impression that other people make. But, actually,—this I can't state as a fact any more than Congressman Cole can state as a fact that the steel workers are getting an edge on other workers—the Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board says that the formula arrived at in the steel case is well within the formula that has been applied in hundreds and hundreds of cases during the past year. And that the wage formula arrived there is merely nothing more than the catch-up formula that the Wage Stabilization Board has been permitting for other workers in other industries.

Congressman Cole: Ah, yes, but the Wage Stabilization Board did not attempt to say nor have they said whether or not the increased wages will cause a rise in prices, and if so, how much. That is what we want to know: if so, how much?

Mr. DiSalle: Congressman, that's out of the jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board. Let the Price Board, let the Price Office decide whether there should be a

price increase or not. They have the rules for it.

Congressman Cole: All right. The Price Board will not do that. The President of the United States has already decided, in my opinion, that this wage increase shall be allowed, and he's set the order down and the boys down below are going to follow it out. (*Applause*)

Mr. DiSalle: Congressman Cole, that is absolutely not so. The meeting was held with Mr. Wilson present. Mr. Wilson claims that the President said to him in an earlier meeting that he would permit a price increase if the facts warranted it. I'm sure that that's the position of the present Director of Price Stabilization. If the price increase is warranted, it will be granted. The only thing that they're asking from the steel industry is to demonstrate that it is needed.

Congressman Cole: I think the price increase, if they grant the wage increase, is of course needed and will come at \$12 additional a ton. And when it comes, then the value of your dollar will be depreciated accordingly.

Mr. DiSalle: I'd like to wager that new tie on that!

Dr. Peterson: Thank you. If this were on television, Mr. Cole's tie would blast, I think, the observers' eye. You might have seen them struggling over this mike. Mr. DiSalle is broader, Mr. Cole is a little taller.

We will continue our Toledo Town Meeting with the question period.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Mr. DiSalle, does the stabilization program embody a plan to raise or lower our standard of living to the level existing as of any specific past date?

Mr. DiSalle: Actually the stabilization program is necessary for the purpose of maintaining our standard of living, and our standard of living has been an ever-increasing standard of living. At the present time, this Nation is better clothed, better housed, better fed than it ever has been in its history before. The standard of living has not suffered.

I'd like to point this out as well, that whereas in the beginning of 1951 we were saving at the annual rate of \$7,800,000,000, which is 3.6 per cent of our disposable income after taxes, at the end of 1951, in the last three quarters of 1951, we were saving at the highest rate that this Nation has ever known—\$20,000,000,000 or 10 per cent of our disposable income after taxes.

Congressman Cole: I want to say a word about the so-called good times and never having it as good as we now have it today. Why do we have it? We have it because of Korea. That is the reason we are having good times. (Applause)

Lady: Can stabilization work on a voluntary basis, or is an enforcement agency necessary? If this agency is necessary, won't Congress allot enough money to enforce a board or a ruling organization?

Congressman Cole: I think that's a very interesting question. Can stabilization work on a voluntary basis? If you mean can price control and wage control work

upon a voluntary basis, it is my judgment that it cannot. But let me say to you that stabilization can work without price and wage control. Stabilization of this economy can be accomplished through inflation control. You control inflation by controlling the supply of money compared to the supply of goods. You control the supply of money by the control of bank credit, by the control of deficit spending, and by increasing production and doing other things to help people to save money.

Mr. DiSalle: Well, I can at least agree with Congressman Cole that stabilization will not work on a voluntary basis. It was tried and it failed. And I also want to point this out, that I was in Toledo minding my own business when Congressman Cole and his colleagues were passing the Defense Production Act of 1950 and making provisions for mandatory price and wage controls, and I think that provision as much as anything else brought on the necessity for the imposition of those controls.

Dr. Peterson: They are fighting again over this mike. Mr. Cole just a quick aphorism, sir.

Congressman Cole: We gave authority for price and wage control in the event we would have an all-out war and it became necessary for rationing by reason of a complete shortage of consumer goods.

Mr. DiSalle: I'd like to say that I never appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee or the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that I wasn't asked by the members of that committee why they weren't impose sooner.

Dr. Peterson: Stay right here, Mr. DiSalle. In the third aisle this young man has a question for you.

Man: Mr. DiSalle, on what basis is the cost of living index figures determined? It's been observed that the cost of living has gone up 3.1 per cent or 3-1/2 per cent, but when I buy groceries or other commodities, it figures up to 10 or 15 per cent.

Mr. DiSalle: The cost of living is figured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and in the consumers' price index is a weighted average of what the average family spends for the things that are necessary for their shelter, for their apparel, for their food, for their miscellaneous items. Just recently one of House Committees went over that index and gave it the stamp of approval that it was a fair and representative index.

Man: Congressman Cole, why was the OPA during World War II more effective than the OPS is now?

Congressman Cole: Thank you. That's also a very interesting question which I think I answered by implication a moment ago. I voted for OPA during World War II, I voted for it the year after World War II. Why? Because there was a great shortage of consumer goods. Because we were then channeling into our military production the know-how, the manufacturing of military items rather than consumer goods. We had rationing then. We do not have rationing now. Rationing is not necessary. You now have price control by competition. We don't need it now. I went to buy my tie, you can buy your shoes, you can buy your ice boxes and refrigerators, you can buy your stoves, your automobiles. Competition is

working today because the economic situation is different and that is why OPA was more satisfactory than OPS is today.

Mr. DiSalle: We can readily see that Congressman Cole was never Director of Price Stabilization, because if he was, he would be here tonight to tell you that day after day he would be forced to say *no* to many people who are asking for price increases. If it wasn't for the ceilings that we have established, prices would be considerably higher than they are now. In fact, a recent study that was submitted to the congressional committees within the past two weeks points to the fact that 80 per cent of consumer items are within 2 per cent of ceilings today, and only as little as 8 per cent are as much as 10 per cent below; and in those items which are military in nature and essential parts of the defense program, 96 per cent of the items are at ceilings. You take off price controls today, and you watch and see the prices rise, and they would rise substantially.

Dr. Peterson: At first I thought we were not going to have enough questions from this fine urbane audience, and now we're going to have too many. I think this one is for Mr. DiSalle.

Man: Mr. DiSalle, stabilization should signify a somewhat dormant state; however, after more than a year of price stabilization, it seems that spiraling prices and our type of stabilization are synonymous. Is this true?

Mr. DiSalle: No, nothing could be further from the truth than that. And just talk to your fellow citizens who are in business today and ask them to determine or tell you whether or not there has been stability established in

prices. There has not been a constant spiral of prices in the past year. In fact the last index figure that was published showed a falling off in the cost of living of .6 per cent from the month of January 15th to February 15th of 1952.

I just want to go back again to this question of whether OPS or OPA has been more effective, and I want to say this, that so many people are inclined to forget facts. I like to talk about facts especially when the facts are on my side. OPA had its start in 1940, and at that time the index was at 100.9. They tried voluntary agreements and different kinds of agreements for approximately a year, and the cost of living went up 15 per cent during that period. Then they had the general maximum price freeze, the equivalent to our general ceiling price regulation, and the cost of living went up an additional 9 per cent, so you find the cost of living in those first two years up 24 per cent. In the past year, the cost of living has gone up 2.2 per cent. Which has been the most effective?

Man: What has stabilization to do with the annual productivity factor?

Mr. DiSalle: It was approved the only time that I know it came up before the Wage Stabilization in connection with the automobile workers and the automobile industry. The four-cents-an-hour productivity factor was approved at that time, but a great deal on the testimony of the automobile makers themselves—Mr. Wilson and Mr. Ford—that the four cents an hour was actually an improvement in production and should be paid on that basis, and they also agreed at that time that they would not make it a basis for an application for price increase.

Lady: Congressman Cole, how can individual citizens be sure that their letters of complaint bear any weight in solving these problems?

Congressman Cole: I think the citizens of America can be definitely sure that their complaints aid in the solving of these problems, if I understand your question correctly. Your letters to your members of Congress and to your Senators are read, are considered, and are answered with a great deal of thought. Even your letters, shall I say, to the Price Stabilization Board are considered.

I think that in America we still have that privilege, and the people must and should follow through with that duty and that obligation because, after all, the people yet in this country are the bosses of those of us who work for you.

Dr. Peterson: Mr. DiSalle, we can tuck in another question here, sir.

Man: Mr. DiSalle, does the Government really want stabilization, or does it believe that a little inflation is a good thing?

Mr. DiSalle: You certainly wouldn't be engaged in the kind of a program that you are engaged in if the Government did not want stabilization. In fact, you wouldn't be in a position of having to say no to so many people if you didn't want effective stabilization. The trouble with too many people is that they are away from the actual operation. They don't know the shots and shells that are constantly going over your head and the pressures that are being applied to get higher prices and higher wages.

Dr. Peterson: Mr. Cole is crowding me, but I must thank you gentlemen. Our time is up. Thank you, Mr. DiSalle and you

Congressman Cole. Thanks also to our Toledo hosts, the Meeting House Series of the First Congregational Church, and its minister, Dr. John Walker and Colonel William H. Blakefield, co-chairman

of the Meeting House Committee, and the management and staff of station WTOL, ABC in Toledo. So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. Does the present stabilization program insure equality of sacrifice for all segments of the population?
 - a. Are living costs rising faster than wages?
 - b. Are rents lagging behind other prices?
 - c. Should price controls be relaxed on such things as foods in plentiful supply and luxury-type goods which do not affect basic living cost?
 - d. How are white-collar workers and fixed-income groups faring under stabilization?

Can stabilization work when price increases are permitted to cover increased labor costs and wage increases are permitted to cover increased living costs?

 - a. Are such measures inflationary?
 - b. Should we stabilize our economy by enacting a rigid wage and price freeze?
 3. Does the fact that the price index has recently dropped slightly indicate that stabilization is working?
 - a. Does the drop indicate that controls can be removed?
 4. Is the Steelworkers Union justified in asking a new wage increase in view of the drop in the price index which will lower the salaries of workers who are covered by automatic escalators?
 - a. Are steel profits high enough to absorb a wage increase without raising prices?
 - b. If not, how would a wage increase for steel workers affect the price of steel and other manufactured goods?
 - c. How would it affect wages in other industries?
 - d. Would such an increase wreck the stabilization program?
-

BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL

Where's *your* vote going this November? And how much will radio and TV appearances of the Presidential candidates influence your choice? It's the bet of most politicians that these two media—which are revolutionizing campaign techniques and spending—will for the first time in history have substantial bearing on the next tenant of the White House.

Wrote one columnist recently, "By choosing to launch his bombshell (the announcement he would not run for re-election) on the radio and TV . . . President Truman formally acknowledged the sweep and power of the new medium as a means of dramatic communication." Other political figures are equally aware of the potentials. Through focusing on the late crime investigating committee, TV has given aspirant Estes Kefauver a valuable head start. In the Republican camp, Senator Taft is said to be "sold" on radio and television stumping—because he feels his numerous air appearances figured importantly in winning the 1950 Senatorial race. Campaign managers for Stassen, Warren, Russell, et al are keeping sharp watch of network time availabilities. And the networks are keeping watch of *them*.

Pre-convention activity on the airways falls into two categories. There is "paid time" in which the would-be candidate, or his supporter, delivers a set campaign speech or installs broadcast lines at a rally. Shaping up as far more significant and exciting to the general public, however, are today's many interview and discussion programs, for which the *programs* go after the speakers. Among these, "American Town Meeting" with its distinctive feature of audience participation, is a recognized leader.

In this voting year of 1952, greater-than-ever effort is being made by the Town Hall radio-TV staff to bring listeners a clear impression of the political issues and personalities. Plans are now underway to schedule the appearance of all Presidential aspirants, or their representatives. This includes a recent invitation to General Dwight Eisenhower in which it was proposed that recorded questions of American citizens be flown to Paris with the General's replies "dubbed in" and presented here on a regular broadcast. Alternatively, he has been invited to appear on "Town Meeting"—both radio and television—upon his return to this country.

For the reference of Bulletin readers, three programs pertinent to the November elections which have been broadcast to date are: "How Will the Truman Administration Look to History?" (Oct. 23 '51); "Who Can Win in 1952?" (Oct. 30, '51); and "The Republican Nomination—Eisenhower or Taft?" (Jan. 22 '52). There will be others between now and November, so keep listening!



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 17

- | | |
|---|---|
| 17. Are We Governed by Lobbies? | 33. How Can Britain and America Reconcile Their Differences? |
| 18. Who Will Pay for the Increased Taxes? | 34. Is This a Man's World? |
| 19. What's Wrong With College Football? | 35. How Can We Get from January to December? |
| 20. Can Legislation Cure Segregation in Housing? | 36. Will Life Be Better in 1952? |
| 21. Will Industrial Japan Dominate Asia's Markets? | 37. How Can We Fight Corruption in Government? |
| 22. Western Germany's Place in Europe. | 38. How Can We Protect American Citizens Behind the Iron Curtain? |
| 23. McCarthyism: Good or Bad? | 39. The Republican Nomination—Eisenhower or Taft? |
| 24. Is the Welfare State Fair to All? | 40. Should Congress Be Televised? |
| 25. Is American Youth Accepting Responsibility? | 41. Is the West Losing the Support of the Middle East? |
| 26. How Will the Truman Administration Look to History? | 42. Are We Trying to Dominate Our European Allies? |
| 27. Who Can Win in 1952? | 43. Are We Losing Our Civil Liberties in Our Search for Security? |
| 28. Are We Teaching People To Think? | 44. Will Universal Military Training Make Better Citizens of Our Youth? |
| 29. The Crisis in American Education. | 45. What Should Be Our Program Toward Asia? |
| 30. Europe and America—Partners or Rivals? | 46. Do Critics and Reviewers Have Too Much Influence? |
| 31. Are We Close To Solving Our Race Problem? | 47. Should We Fear the New Germany? |
| 32. Are Our Protestant Churches Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men? | |

Order single copies at 15c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, New York 36, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

26 Weeks for Only
\$3.00
Single Copies 15c



AMERICA'S Town Meeting OF THE AIR

ON TELEVISION

EVERY SUNDAY

Sponsored by

REICHHOLD CHEMICALS, INC.

On These ABC-TV Stations:

Atlanta	- - - -	WLTV	6:30 p. m.
Baltimore	- - - -	WAAM-TV	3:00 p. m.
Charlotte	- - - -	WBTV	4:30 p. m.
Chicago	- - - -	WENR-TV	5:30 p. m.
Cincinnati	- - - -	WCPO-TV	3:30 p. m.
Cleveland	- - - -	WEWS	6:30 p. m.
Detroit	- - - -	WXYZ-TV	6:30 p. m.
Ft Worth	- - - -	WBAP-TV	3:30 p. m.
Los Angeles	- - - -	KECA-TV	6:30 p. m.
New York	- - - -	WJZ-TV	6:30 p. m.
Philadelphia	- - - -	WFIL-TV	6:30 p. m.
San Francisco	- - - -	KGO-TV	6:30 p. m.
Washington	- - - -	WMAL-TV	6:30 p. m.